

2. Restoration and creation of wetlands where hydrology is naturally controlled by sea-level fluctuations, but where elevation is not restored to within the natural range of fluctuations (usually, elevation is not lowered sufficiently).

3. Planting hydric hardwoods in areas where the historic condition would have supported a fire-maintained Wet Pine Flat (wet savanna on mineral soil). By excluding fire in such areas, a pocosin-like understory eventually develops, providing fuel for wildfires that will destroy hardwoods.

4. Excluding fire or failure to manage a natural, fire-maintained ecosystem with prescribed burning.

5. Creation of stormwater detention basin that are deep and small in area relative to the drainage basin they serve. Such areas are designed to hold a large pulses of water for short periods. They do not mimic any known natural wetland ecosystem and their period of saturation would be unlikely to meet jurisdictional wetland status.

6. Failure to control competition of vines and/or herbaceous plants with planted trees. This was rare: only one case found.

While the above outline provides a general list of strength and weaknesses of the program, they do not address specific problems we encountered in trying find information to evaluate sites. These problems would be encountered by anyone attempting to re-create site histories. Therefore, the following list of recommendations is provided to improve the utility of site data, particularly monitoring data, and the organization of data.

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

(1) Success criteria for vegetation seemed to require survival of some minimum density after a prescribe period of time for the entire site. If plant survival data are averaged (pooled) across plots within a given site, valuable information on variability may be lost, and may prevent expressing projects as having partial successes or failures. Similarly, when data on intra-site variation are lacking, contingency measures cannot be effectively applied to pertinent portions of a project.

(2) Vegetation monitoring plots were often not stratified by cover-type or geomorphic location. Therefore, one could not tell whether a particular planting mix was appropriate for the geomorphic location of the planting.

(3) Vegetation monitoring plots did not appear to be randomly placed and sometimes did not seem to represent the geomorphic variability within sites. We suggest that a written protocol be established for determining the location and numbers of plots needed to provide an unbiased estimate of survival.